



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,001	02/08/2002	Billy Hogan	2380-604	6407
23117	7590	10/06/2005	EXAMINER	
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC			NGUYEN, KHAI MINH	
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR				
ARLINGTON, VA 22203			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2687	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/068,001	HOGAN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Khai M. Nguyen	2687

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 and 42-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-41 and 73-94 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4, 15, 16, 42-45, 50, 51, 54-57 and 66-68 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 5-14, 17-19, 46-49, 52, 53, 58-65 and 69-72 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
      1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
      3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Response to Arguments**

1. Applicant's argument with respect to claim 1-19, and 42-72 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

2. The indicated allowability of claims 42-53 are withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to teaches compares the stored access group classification with contents of the access group eligibility message to determine whether the user equipment unit is allowed access to the cell for which the access group eligibility message is transmitted. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 15-16, 42-45, 50-51, 54-57, and 66-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koo et al. (U.S.Pat-6889040) in view of Shaughnessy et al. (U.S.Pat-6141347).

Regarding claim 1, Koo teaches a telecommunications network which transmits (fig.1), in a broadcast channel over an air interface (fig.1, element 14, 16), an access group eligibility message which enables a user equipment unit which receives the access group eligibility message to make a determination whether the user equipment unit is eligible to operate in a cell for which the access group eligibility message is transmitted (fig.1-2, abstract, col.1, lines 48-54), the determination involving a comparison of access group eligibility information transmitted in the access group message and an access group classification (fig.1-2, abstract, col.1, lines 48-54)

Koo fails to specifically disclose an access group classification is stored at the user equipment unit. Shaughnessy teaches a wireless communication systems and, in particular, to a wireless communication system the incorporates multicast addressing. However, Shaughnessy teaches an access group classification is stored at the user equipment unit (fig.3, element 320, col.4, lines 43-61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an access group classification is stored at the user equipment unit as taught by Shaughnessy with Koo teaching in order to provide easy scalability and should minimize or eliminate network connection processing at call initiation.

Regarding claim 2, Shaughnessy and Koo further teaches the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the access group eligibility message indicates what subscriber groups are

eligible to operate in the cell for which the access group eligibility message is transmitted (see Koo, fig.1-2, abstract, col.1, lines 48-54).

Regarding claim 3, Shaughnessy and Koo further teaches the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the access group eligibility message indicates what restriction groups are not eligible to operate in the cell for which the access group eligibility message is transmitted (see Shaughnessy, fig.6, col.8, lines 14-52).

Regarding claim 4, Shaughnessy and Koo further teaches the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the access group eligibility message includes a bitmap which indicates eligibility for plural access groups (see Koo, fig.2, col.2, lines 31-60).

Regarding claim 15, Shaughnessy and Koo further teaches the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the access group classification message is one of a location update response (see Shaughnessy, col.2, line 45 to col.3, line 6) and a location update reject message which includes the access group classification (see Shaughnessy, col.2, line 45 to col.3, line 6).

Regarding claim 16, Shaughnessy and Koo further teaches the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the access group classification message is one of a location update response (see Shaughnessy, col.2, line 45 to col.3, line 6) and a location update reject message which includes the access group classification and a version field associated with the access group classification (see Shaughnessy, col.2, line 45 to col.3, line 6).

Regarding claim 42, Koo teaches a user equipment unit which receives over an air interface an access group classification message (fig.1) and an access group eligibility message (fig.1, element 14, 16, abstract), the access group classification message being generated by a core network node for advising the user equipment unit as to which of the plural access groups the user equipment unit belongs (fig.1-2, abstract, col.1, lines 48-54), the access group eligibility message being generated by a radio access network node for specifying eligibility of plural access groups to operate in a cell for which the access group eligibility message is transmitted (fig.1-2, abstract, col.1, lines 48-54), the user equipment unit comprising:

compares the stored access group classification with contents of the access group eligibility message to determine whether the user equipment unit is allowed access to the cell for which the access group eligibility message is transmitted (fig.1-2, abstract, col.1, lines 48-54).

Koo fails to specifically disclose an access controller which stores an access group classification obtained from the access group eligibility message. Shaughnessy

teaches a wireless communication systems and, in particular, to a wireless communication system the incorporates multicast addressing. However, Shaughnessy teaches an access controller which stores an access group classification obtained from the access group eligibility message (fig.3, element 320, col.4, lines 43-61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an access controller which stores an access group classification obtained from the access group eligibility message as taught by Shaughnessy with Koo teaching in order to provide easy scalability and should minimize or eliminate network connection processing at call initiation.

Regarding claim 43, Shaughnessy and Koo further teaches the apparatus of claim 42, wherein the access group eligibility message indicates what subscriber groups are eligible to operate in the cell for which the access group eligibility message is transmitted (see Koo, fig.1-2, abstract, col.1, lines 48-54).

Regarding claim 44, Shaughnessy and Koo further teaches the apparatus of claim 42, wherein the access group eligibility message indicates what restriction groups are not eligible to operate in the cell for which the access group eligibility message is transmitted (see Shaughnessy, fig.6, col.8, lines 14-52).

Regarding claim 45, Shaughnessy and Koo further teaches the apparatus of claim 42, wherein the access group eligibility message includes a bitmap which indicates eligibility for plural access groups (see Koo, fig.2, col.2, lines 31-60).

Regarding claim 50, Shaughnessy and Koo further teaches the apparatus of claim 42, wherein the access group classification message is one of a location update response (see Shaughnessy, col.2, line 45 to col.3, line 6) and a location update reject message which includes the access group classification (see Shaughnessy, col.2, line 45 to col.3, line 6).

Regarding claim 51, Shaughnessy and Koo further teaches the apparatus of claim 42, wherein the access group classification message includes the access group classification (see Shaughnessy, col.2, line 45 to col.3, line 6) and a version field associated with the access group classification (see Shaughnessy, col.2, line 45 to col.3, line 6).

Regarding claim 54, Koo teaches a method of operating a telecommunications network comprising:

transmitting, in a broadcast channel over an air interface (fig.1), an access group eligibility message (fig.1-2, abstract);

a user equipment unit receives the access group eligibility message (fig.1-2, abstract) and which user the access group eligibility message to make determination whether the user equipment unit is eligible to operate in a cell for which the access group eligibility message is transmitted (fig.1-2, abstract), involving a comparison of access group eligibility information transmitted in the access group message (fig.1-2, abstract) and

Koo fails to specifically disclose an access group classification which is stored at the user equipment. Shaughnessy teaches a wireless communication systems and, in particular, to a wireless communication system the incorporates multicast addressing. However, Shaughnessy teaches an access group classification which is stored at the user equipment (fig.3, element 320, col.4, lines 43-61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an access group classification which is stored at the user equipment as taught by Shaughnessy with Koo teaching in order to provide easy scalability and should minimize or eliminate network connection processing at call initiation.

Regarding claim 55, Shaughnessy and Koo further teaches the method of claim 54, further comprising including in the access group eligibility message an indication of what subscriber groups are eligible to operate in the cell for which the access group eligibility message is transmitted (see Koo, fig.1-2, col.1, lines 48-54).

Regarding claim 56, Shaughnessy and Koo further teaches the method of claim 54, further comprising including in the access group eligibility message an indication of what restriction groups are not eligible to operate in the cell for which the access group eligibility message is transmitted (see Shaughnessy, fig.6, col.8, lines 14-52).

Regarding claim 57, Shaughnessy and Koo further teaches the method of claim 54, further comprising including in the access group eligibility message a bitmap which indicates eligibility for plural access groups (see Koo, fig.2, col.2, lines 31-60).

Regarding claim 66, Shaughnessy and Koo further teaches the method of claim 54, further comprising:

upon the user equipment unit entering a new cell which involves a transition to a new location area (see Shaughnessy, col.3, lines 34-38), checking the access group eligibility message transmitted for the new cell (see Shaughnessy, col.8, lines 14-52); and

comparing the stored access group classification with contents of the access group eligibility message to determine whether the user equipment unit is allowed access to the new cell (see Koo, abstract, see Shaughnessy, col.8, lines 14-52).

Regarding claim 67, Shaughnessy and Koo further teaches the method of claim 66, further comprising, upon the user equipment unit entering a new cell which does not involve a transition to a new location area (see Shaughnessy, col.3, lines 34-38), the user equipment unit not checking the access group eligibility message (see Shaughnessy, col.8, lines 14-52).

Regarding claim 68, Shaughnessy and Koo further teaches the method of claim 54, wherein the access group classification message is one of a location update response (see Shaughnessy, col.2, line 45 to col.3, line 6) and a location update reject message which includes the access group classification (see Shaughnessy, col.2, line 45 to col.3, line 6).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 5-14, 17-19, 46-48, 52-53, 58-65, and 69-72 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Citation of Pertinent Prior Art***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2687

**Yahagi** (U.S.Pat-6370378) discloses Cellular communicating network and method for locating mobile stations using hierarchically arranged databases.

**Shuster** (U.S.Pub-20020089960) discloses Method for verifying geographic location of wide area network users.

**Stephens** (U.S.Pat-5995823) discloses Method and system in a wireless communications network for providing toll restrictions based on the geographic location of an originator.

**Wan** (U.S.Pub-20020147024) discloses Power management system for a mobile unit by reduce neighbor cell scanning.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khai M. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571.272.7923. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on 571.272.7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Khai Nguyen  
Au : 2687

9/27/2005

  
co 13 105  
LESTER G. KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER